

Appl. No. 10/605,853  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 16, 2005

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **1. Objection to the specification:**

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 2, line 14, 164 should be a "second linear portion". Appropriate correction is required.

5

#### **Response:**

Paragraph 0005 of the specification has been amended as shown above. Acceptance of the corrected specification is respectfully requested.

#### **10      2. Rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

#### **15      Response:**

Claim 7 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

#### **3. Rejection of claims 1-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):**

20      Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Deeg et al (DE 3739272, hereinafter referred to as Deeg).

#### **Response:**

The applicant would like to point out how claim 1 is patentably distinguished from Deeg. In the claimed invention, the transmission belt is fixed to a fastener of the scanning carriage housing at one location and is also attached to a sliding mechanism at another location. An elastic device is connected to the housing at a first end and to the sliding mechanism at a second end.

25

Appl. No. 10/605,853  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 16, 2005

On the other hand, Deeg (DE 3739272) teaches a different arrangement. Deeg teaches that the transmission belt 19 is only attached to the carriage 7 with clamping device 8. The transmission belt 19 is able to freely move through guidance portion 9 in order to  
5 enable to the transmission belt 19 to have the right amount of tension (see column 2, lines 15-33 of Deeg).

Deeg does not teach the following two claimed limitations contained in claim 1:

10       **“a sliding mechanism disposed on the housing and capable of sliding in a linear direction on the housing, the sliding mechanism engaging the transmission belt so that there is no relative displacement between the sliding mechanism and the transmission belt; and**  
      an elastic device fixed to the housing at a first end and fixed to the sliding  
15       **mechanism at a second end for maintaining proper tension in the transmission belt.”**

Deeg does not teach a sliding mechanism that engages the transmission belt and is capable of sliding in a linear direction on the housing. In addition, Deeg does not teach  
20 that an elastic device is attached to both the housing at a first end and to the sliding mechanism at a second end. For these reasons, Deeg does not teach all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claims 2-6 and 8 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-6 and 8 is respectfully requested.

25       In view of the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/605,853  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 16, 2005

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: Nov. 10, 2005

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526  
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.  
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562  
Facsimile: 806-498-6673  
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)